



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*CP*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,654	06/28/2001	Manoel Tenorio	020431.0841	6772

7590 10/19/2006

Christopher W. Kennerly  
Baker Botts L.L.P.  
Suite 600  
2001 Ross Avenue  
Dallas, TX 75201

EXAMINER
----------

RIMELL, SAMUEL G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2164

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/895,654

**Applicant(s)**

TENORIO, MANOEL

**Examiner**

Sam Rimell

**Art Unit**

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

  
**SAM RIMELL**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

Preliminary Note: In view of applicant's declaration of December 12, 2005, and upon further discussion with Special Program Examiner Pinchus Laufer, the rejection of claims 1-28 under 35 USC 102(e) in view of Tenorio et al. has been vacated. This office action includes new grounds of rejection not necessitated by any amendment, and thus is made non-final.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vedula et al. (U.S. Patent 6,823,495).

Claim 1: FIG. 5 illustrates a graphical user interface which constitutes a mapping module.

The mapping module (graphical interface) receives a source schema (4) on the left side and target schema (10) on the right side.

Each schema is a taxonomy (i.e. a classification arrangement) comprised of a hierarchy of classes defined by records. For example, "Record 11" in the source schema (4) is a parent class and all indented items below "Record 11" are subclasses.

Both the source schema and target schema define an ontology (i.e. relationships between records, such as the relationship of parent class to subclass or source schema to target schema). As seen in FIG. 3C, each record has defined attributes, thus the ontologies in both the source schema and the target schema contain attributes.

Art Unit: 2164

Referring back to FIG. 5, classes (referring to either parent classes or subclasses) in the source schema can be associated to classes (referring to either parent classes or subclasses) in the target schema. The association is achieved by the mappings (16a) and (16b).

The ontology generation module is the processing engine (26) and map (28) illustrated in FIG. 2 which support the creation of the graphical interface in FIG. 5.

Vedula et al. differs in that the individual records are not specifically referring to products, but are generic business document records (col. 3, line 10). Forming the records to contain non-functional descriptive material, such as product information, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art (*In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983): “when descriptive material is not functionally related to the substrate, the descriptive material will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability”).

Claim 2: User input in the form of highlighting (18a in FIGS. 4A and 4B) achieves the function of indicating which source classes are to be associated with which target classes. The association is established when lines (16a) or (16b) link the source and target schemas.

Claim 3: FIG. 5 is a view of a graphical user interface, and thus is a graphical representation of the taxonomies of the source and target schemas as well as the associations between the schemas seen by the user.

Claim 4: Within the source schema, some of the classes are leaf nodes, such as “Record 2” and “Record 8”.

Art Unit: 2164

Claim 5: The mappings (16a) and (16b) define intersections between the product ontologies of the source class and target class. These mappings are also ontologies (i.e. relationships) that further define both the source classes and the target classes.

Claim 6: The mappings can define intersections between any classes (parent class or subclass) in either the source schema or target schema.

Claim 7: The subject matter of claim 7 only differs from Vedula et al. in that the classes in the source schema and target schema are not defined as being associated with a seller. In other words, the records do not define seller information. However, modifying the records to define seller information is a modification to include non-functional descriptive material which is considered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art (*In re Gulack*, cited above).

Claim 8: The source records and target records are XML business documents. Any of the mapping linkages (16a or 16b) constitute pointers. Since either a single document or a set of documents constitutes a database, the mapping links define pointers between databases. Modifying the documents to refer to seller information would have been a modification to include non-functional descriptive material, and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, as per *In re Gulack*.

Claim 9: See remarks for claim 1.

Claim 10: See remarks for claim 2.

Claim 11: See remarks for claim 3.

Claim 12: See remarks for claim 4.

Claim 13: See remarks for claim 5.

Claim 14: See remarks for claim 6.

Claim 15: See remarks for claim 7.

Claim 16: See remarks for claim 8.

Claim 17: See remarks for claim 1.

Claim 18: See remarks for claim 2.

Claim 19: See remarks for claim 3.

Claim 20: See remarks for claim 4.

Claim 21: See remarks for claim 5.

Claim 22: See remarks for claim 6.

Claim 23: See remarks for claim 7.

Claim 24: See remarks for claim 8.

Claim 25: See remarks for claim 1.

Claim 26: See remarks for claim 1-3 and 8.

Claim 27: See remarks for claims 1-3 and 8.

Claim 28: See remarks for claims 1-3 and 8.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Sam Rimell at telephone number (571) 272-4084.



Sam Rimell  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2164